

Message

From: Jones, Enesta [Jones.Enesta@epa.gov]
Sent: 6/1/2017 6:41:48 PM
To: Grantham, Nancy [Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov]
Subject: Fwd: AMY: OPEN INQUIRIES FOR REVIEW (5/31)

Hi Nancy, I just sent this to Amy. Let me know if it is helpful.

Enesta Jones
U.S. EPA
Office of Media Relations
Office: 202.564.7873
Cell: 202.236.2426

"The root of all joy is gratefulness."

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Jones, Enesta" <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Date: June 1, 2017 at 1:49:09 PM EDT
To: "Graham, Amy" <graham.amy@epa.gov>
Cc: "Jones, Enesta" <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: AMY: OPEN INQUIRIES FOR REVIEW (5/31)

Amy, are any on here that belong to me ok to send? Clarification or rewrite needed?

Enesta Jones
U.S. EPA
Office of Media Relations
Office: 202.564.7873
Cell: 202.236.2426

"The root of all joy is gratefulness."

Begin forwarded message:

From: "StClair, Christie" <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>
Date: May 31, 2017 at 5:06:35 PM EDT
To: "Wilcox, Jahan" <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>, "Graham, Amy" <graham.amy@epa.gov>
Cc: "Jones, Enesta" <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>, "Lynn, Tricia" <lynn.tricia@epa.gov>, "Daguillard, Robert" <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>, "Valentine, Julia"

Subject: OPEN INQUIRIES FOR REVIEW (5/31)

9 new requests from today awaiting review below:

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Pittsburgh Tribune Review, DEADLINE: 5/31 (Enesta Jones)
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Fox News, DEADLINE: 5/31 (Tricia Lynn)
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->BNA, DEADLINE: 5/31 (Robert Daguillard)
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Honey Colony, DEADLINE: 5/31 (Enesta Jones)
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Detroit News, DEADLINE: 5/31 (Tricia Lynn)
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Huffington Post, DEADLINE: 5/24 (Robert Daguillard)
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->StarNews, DEADLINE: ? (Enesta Jones)
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->InsideEPA, DEADLINE: ? (Enesta Jones)
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Pittsburgh Tribune Review, DEADLINE: ? (Enesta Jones)

6 requests from yesterday also awaiting review below:

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->BNA, DEADLINE 5/30/17 (Christie St Clair)
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Door & Window Market Magazine, DEADLINE 5/30/17 (Tricia Lynn)
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->US Right to Know, DEADLINE 5/24 (Robert Daguillard)
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->PBS Newshour, DEADLINE 5/26 (Robert Daguillard)
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Center for Public Integrity, DEADLINE 6/1/17 (Tricia Lynn)

Pittsburgh Tribune Review, DEADLINE: 5/31 (Enesta Jones)

Q: I was wondering whether different-sized water systems have different requirements if they are exceeding the EPA action level. If so, is there a document that spells that out? This time I'm looking at Braddock (PA), which serves about 2,000, according to the EPA database. I'm wondering if they have fewer requirements than PWSA, which serves over 500,000.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

The Lead and Copper Rule Quick Reference Guide summarizes requirements for public water systems of all sizes, for more information please visit:
<https://www.epa.gov/dwreginfo/lead-and-copper-rule>

For detailed information, please visit: <https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=531617f923c3de2cbf5d12ae4663f56d&mc=true&node=sp40.23.141.i&rgn=div6>

Fox News, DEADLINE: 5/31 (Tricia Lynn)

Background:

Reporter is working on a piece regarding Northern California's Duarte Nursery, which is facing trial and fines for violating the Clean Water Act. The reporter wants to know EPA's involvement in the case and why action was taken against the nursery owner. Reporter is Jason Kopp (Jason.Kopp@FOXNEWS.COM) of Fox News.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

BNA, DEADLINE: 5/31 (Robert Daguillard)

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Please advise.

Inquiry: The EPA failed to prove its registration of Nanosilva LLC's nanosilver antibacterial additive was in the public's interest, a federal appeals court ruled May 30.

cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/opinions/2017/05/30/15-72308.pdf

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Honey Colony, DEADLINE: 5/31 (Enesta Jones)

Background: This writer is asking about the state of water (and air) on airplanes after finding a 2012 EPA study that found that one in ten airplanes tested positive for Coliform bacteria. The writer is asking us to respond to allegations by the Association of Flight Attendants that the rule isn't stringent enough, how do airlines take the proper precautions to ensure proper water quality on airplanes, and contributions to poor air quality on airlines (We defer to FAA on that). Note: This study was done before we launched the reporting system, which supports a differing trend that people can see online. Our response is publicly available. Writer is Tyler MacDonald, HoneyColony, macdonaldtyler958@gmail.com

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

To learn more about ADWR please visit: <https://www.epa.gov/dwreginfo/aircraft-drinking-water-rule#compliance>

To find data from EPA's ARCS, please visit: <https://www.epa.gov/dwreginfo/adwr-compliance-reports>

Please reach out to the Federal Aviation Administration re: air quality on airplanes.

Inquiry: 1. In terms of regulation on airline water, the Association of Flight Attendants said that they don't "believe this regulation goes far enough or is sufficiently enforced." Do you believe that progress has been made in this respect since then? If so, in what way?

2. How do you think that airlines can take the proper steps to ensure proper water quality on airplanes?

3. There have been cases of people taking action against airlines due to poor air quality. Do you think that passengers should be doing the same when getting sick from poor water quality?

4. What do you think is the biggest contributor to poor air quality on airlines, and how do you think this problem can best be addressed?

Any feedback appreciated. Thanks!

Detroit News, DEADLINE: 5/31 (Tricia Lynn)

Background: Reporter is interested in the budget figures for the Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification program. Specifically, she's wondering what a reduction in "workyears" refers to. Reporter is Melissa Burke (mburke@detroitnews.com) of Detroit News.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Inquiry: I'm interested in the budget figures for the Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification program. I noted the funding reduction, but hoped you could clarify what the reduction in "workyears" refers to. Is that staff reductions? See numbered page 41 of this PDF: <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-05/documents/fy-2018-congressional-justification.pdf>

Huffington Post, DEADLING: 5/24 (Robert Daguillard)

Background: Determination of acute oral, dermal, eye, and inhalation toxicity is usually the initial step in the assessment and evaluation of the toxic characteristics of a pesticide active ingredient or end-use formulation. These data provide information on health hazards likely to arise when applying the product or when exposed soon after application. Under FIFRA, subchronic and chronic toxicity tests are examples of long-term toxicity tests required for active ingredients. The human health risk assessment process is conservative in that maximum legal use rates for applicators and maximum legal residue levels for dietary exposure assumptions are used, thus ensuring that when a pesticide is used according to the label, people are well protected. Cary Gillam – carevgillamnewsnow@yahoo.com

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Inquiry: I need clarity on an issue that continues to percolate in this glyphosate/Roundup debate. Does the EPA **require** long term toxicity studies for full formulated pesticide products such as Roundup or only for the active ingredients in those products? You probably are aware that many people make this assertion but the EPA information on this topic posted on various web pages is a bit ambiguous. Could you please provide clarification on this issue?

StarNews, DEADLINE: ? (Enesta Jones)

Background: OW, ORD, OCSPP and Region 4 provided input for this response. This reporter is working on a story about perfluoroalkyl substances (PFASs -- the group of chemicals PFOA and PFOS are part of) and the chemical, GenX, in some drinking water systems in New Hanover and Brunswick counties. He is asking specifically about our review of GenX, the safety of it, and our involvement in the Cape Fear River watershed.

Our scientists, Drs. Andrew Lindstrom and Mark Strynar, co-authored a paper regarding PFAS in drinking water systems in New Hanover (N.C.) County and Brunswick (N.C.) County. The paper is titled "Legacy and Emerging Perfluoroalkyl Substances are Important Drinking Water Contaminants in the Cape Fear River Watershed of North Carolina" - <http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/acs.estlett.6b00398> - published in the peer-reviewed journal *Environmental Science and Technology* in 2016. Our responses are publicly available. Reporter is Vaughn Hagerty, Vaughn.Hagerty@gmail.com

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Inquiry: Among other sources, I'm referencing the paper "Legacy and Emerging Perfluoroalkyl Substances Are Important Drinking Water Contaminants in the Cape Fear River Watershed of North Carolina."

I've interviewed Professor Sun and am scheduled to speak with Professor Knappe this week. I'd like to discuss the issue with one or both of you, as well, either by phone or via email exchange. Is this something we can arrange? The story is currently set to run in late May or early June. The lead author (Mei Sun) has confirmed that the treatment plant at Community C in the paper is the Cape Fear Public Utility Authority in Wilmington, N.C. I'd like to know how someone in the community served by CFPUA should interpret these results, specifically in terms of the concentrations of GenX. According to the paper, median concentrations were 671 ppb. I'm asking this in the context of EPA's latest advisory level for PFOA/PFOS, which GenX is meant to replace. As I understand it, the advisory level for PFOA/PFOS is 70 ppt. GenX was present at several times that concentration. Does this raise any health concerns at all? Is this nothing to be concerned about?

What is the status of EPA's review of the environmental and human safety of GenX?

What is the EPA's current position regarding the safety of GenX?

Has or will the EPA take any actions regarding the results from this paper? Is the EPA monitoring the situation and/or conducting its own tests regarding GenX in the Cape Fear River watershed? If so, what, specifically is or will it do and when? If nothing has been done or is planned, why not? What would it take for the EPA to get involved regarding this situation?

The lead author has confirmed that the fluorochemical manufacturer located upstream of the CFPUA is a plant in Fayetteville, N.C., formerly owned by DuPont and now by Chemours. Has the EPA contacted the plant operator regarding these findings? If so, what was the nature of that communication? If not, why not?

InsideEPA, DEADLINE: ? (Enesta Jones)

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Inquiry: I wanted to check with you to see if, given today's announcement by EPA staying certain requirements of the oil and gas methane rule, you have an update on this inquiry. I'm wondering how the proposal still under White House OMB review is different from what was announced today. Please let me know as soon as possible.

Pittsburgh Tribune Review, DEADLINE: ? (Enesta Jones)

Q: I was wondering whether different-sized water systems have different requirements if they are exceeding the EPA action level. If so, is there a document that spells that out? This time I'm looking at Braddock (PA), which serves about 2,000, according to the EPA database. I'm wondering if they have fewer requirements than PWSA, which serves over 500,000.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

The Lead and Copper Rule Quick Reference Guide summarizes requirements for public water systems of all sizes at:

<https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi?Dockkey=60001N8P.txt>

For detailed information, please visit: <https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=531617f923c3de2cbf5d12ae4663f56d&mc=true&node=sp40.23.141.i&rqn=div6>

BNA, DEADLINE 5/30 (Christie St Clair)

Background: The reporter plans to write about the long-standing policy dispute about whether Safer Choice determinations should be hazard-based or risk-based. The concept came up during a recent industry meeting, in which the conversation focused on Procter & Gamble's Tide Coldwater detergent. Reporter: Pat Rizzuto, prizzuto@bna.com.

Suggested response: EPA's program staff engaged in discussions with P&G in 2007, but the company did not formally apply for the label. EPA treats product formulations submitted under the Safer Choice program (formerly known as Design for the Environment), as confidential.

- 1) **Inquiry:** What year did P&G apply for the DfE or Safer Choice label?

- 2) <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Did the voluntary program formerly reject the detergent because it's ingredients didn't meet the program's health and environmental criteria?
- 3) <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Did the program informally let P&G know the ingredients wouldn't qualify?
- 4) <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Did P&G ever submit a substitute formula for Tide Coldwater to try again for the label?
- 5) <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Is EPA able to tell me what criteria the detergents' ingredients failed? For example, did the ingredients raise health concerns? Environmental concerns?

Door & Window Market Magazine, DEADLINE 5/30/17 (Tricia Lynn)

Background:

Reporter is asking for the most recent annual budget figure for Energy Star's Windows, Doors and Skylights program. Reporter Trey Barrineau (tbarrineau@glass.com) is editor of *Door & Window Market* magazine.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Inquiry: I was wondering if you could provide me with the most recent annual budget figure for Energy Star's Windows, Doors and Skylights program?

US Right to Know, DEADLINE 5/24 (Robert Daguillard)

Background:

Carey Gillam is a longtime environmental freelance journalist who's frequently reached out to EPA in the past for questions on pesticide active ingredients like glyphosate and chlorpyrifos. She usually writes for the Huffington Post and works with a non-profit organization called US Right to Know (www.usrtk.org) that focuses on food safety issues. Carey Gillam – careygillamnewsnow@yahoo.com

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Inquiry: I need clarity on an issue that continues to percolate in this glyphosate/Roundup debate. Does the EPA **require** long term toxicity studies for full formulated pesticide products such as Roundup or only for the active ingredients in those products? You probably are aware that many people make this assertion but the EPA information on this topic posted on various web pages is a bit ambiguous. Since I keep seeing repeated claims that EPA requires zero testing of formulated products like Roundup I'd like to clarify that if need be. I see tests on formulations that have been submitted to EPA and I see language regarding formulated products in EPA registration documents, so I'm hoping you can lay out exactly what is required.

PBS Newshour, DEADLINE 5/26 (Robert Daguillard)

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Inquiry: I'm working on a story that involves several environmentalist claims related to fracking, radium and carcinogens. Hoping to speak to one of the researchers involved with this report to help fact-check these claims. Is someone available to speak tomorrow?

Center for Public Integrity, DEADLINE 6/1/17 (Tricia Lynn)

Background:

Reporter is asking whether it's accurate to say that the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program is zeroed out in the President's FY18 budget request, and if so, whether the program will continue in any way. Reporter is Jamie Hopkins (jhopkins@publicintegrity.org) of the Center for Public Integrity.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Inquiry: Could you clarify the status of the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program in the president's FY18 budget request? I've seen several stories saying it would be zeroed out. Is that the case, and if so, does the budget propose to continue the program in some way or end it?